

days of great happiness and he left knowing that his bride Ann would be here waiting for him to come home. How these had to be wonderful thoughts and memories for Bill to take with him.

Now during the war the boys could not tell us where they were stationed overseas but Bill did write he had seen his first Kangaroo. Years later reading a book on Australian airfields during the war I would read where Bill and his squadron with their aircraft would come to Australia by ships. Here the aircraft would be offloaded, reassembled, test flown and on to New Guinea.

Now in New Guinea in about one month Bill would fly his last mission. It was a big one, 16 of those fighters were in that formation. They were flying a protective cover for some air transports. That flight would enter into a box canyon where the mountains went up to 10 and 12 thousand feet. The weather deteriorated so badly that the flight could not turn and exit that canyon. The pilots all had to break their formation and climb blindly up through the clouds. Bill never came up. In the days that followed, his good buddy then Capt. Roddy would fly search missions over that area but the jungle was not ready to give up its secret.

Now I was with the family that Sunday evening when the notice of a telegram came. You can imagine the thoughts, the fear, and the prayers that went through that family that long night for a war time telegram was most always bad news. Very early the next morning I drove Bill's dad to get that telegram. I will never forget the look on his face and what he said as he came back to the car.

He said, "It's Bill, it's Bill, he is missing in action. This will kill my wife." We had to take this news back home. I can still see Mom and all the sisters on the back porch as we drove in the yard. I guess they knew by his face that it was bad news. All that poor man could do was to keep trying to tell them that Bill was not dead, Bill was not dead, Bill was missing in action.

Two years later the second telegram came. Bill was presumed dead.

In the years that followed we lost Dad, Mom, and a sister, Jean. I can assure you that their thoughts, their hopes and their prayers were that someday Bill would be coming home.

Many, many years later while reading a book of the air wars in New Guinea, I would read in this book that Flight Officer Wilfrid Desilets was lost in the jungles of New Guinea forever. That's the way it remained for 53 long years. Then into our lives came the most amazing young man that I have ever had the opportunity to meet and call a friend. He is a successful businessman, a great writer, a fellow pilot but most of all he was an adventurer and a man with a quest. This man's quest was to find an aircraft that a great uncle had been lost in during this war. The uncle's body had been recovered some 14 years later. This man knows well what a family goes through. On his second trip to New Guinea high up in the mountains and deep in the jungle, he, with the natives, would find Bill and his aircraft. Now he notified the proper authorities and he knew that they could take years to make a recovery identification, and then notify a family. And he so rightfully thought that if Bill still had a family that they would be aging and should know. So upon his return he learned that Bill was probably from the Worcester area so he, with his secretary Arlean, started a massive telephone search for the surname Desilets. They were finally successful and notified Yvette, one of the sisters. Now when we first heard what this stranger said he had done it was unbelievable, but we learned he had done it.

Now as all of you might well expect there are not adequate words to express the feel-

ings that this family has for this man, the gratitude, the great respect, yes the love we feel for this man. So for today I am simply going to say thank you. Yes, thank you Fred Hagen, for without you we would never have had our day today. I guess Fred it is your day too for I have the feeling that you have adopted this family and I know we have adopted you.

We have met and made such wonderful new friends during this time. We have with us Colonel Roddy and a Colonel Benz, two men, fighter pilots who were in that flight with Bill on his last mission. You can imagine the honor it was for me to meet these men and talk and learn of Bill's last mission. We were recently invited to Bill's fighter squadron reunion. We went there as guests and came home honored members. We heard such wonderful stories and memories of Bill. One I would like to share with you today. It is from a letter that a Sergeant Iddings had written to Colonel Roddy when he learned Bill had been found. In his letter he expressed the great sorrow that the maintenance and ground support boys felt when Bill was missing. He also said that in his mind Bill's tombstone should be engraved with a blue ribbon and on it, it should say that Bill was a blue ribbon gentleman and a blue ribbon pilot. How I wish the Sergeant was with us today that we may thank him but he to passed away last year.

To you sisters if I may. We have lived with this tragedy most all of our lives. Now that we have what some may call closure I would hope that when you think of Bill or look at his pictures maybe your hearts may be just a little lighter and remember too Bill will always remain that handsome young man. He will never grow old as we have. I know too that each of you have your own special memories of growing up with Bill. Cherish them for they are yours forever.

I, for one, will always honor Bill for he was the type of young man who, as his country was going to war, would be among the first to volunteer and serve.

Bill was my hero for as a young man watching him fly his fighter made me want to be a pilot like him.

Now if we had to lose Bill during this war, then I am grateful that it would be while Bill was fulfilling his greatest dream, for Bill was a fighter pilot.

Today from here, Bill will be taken to rest with his Mom and Dad. Bill is no longer lost in that jungle. Bill is now home, home with his family truly forever.●

#### REREFERRAL OF S. 28

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that S. 28 be discharged from the Energy Committee and referred to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

#### REREFERRAL OF S. 785

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent S. 785 be discharged from the Committee on Armed Services and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

#### AMENDING THE PEACE CORPS ACT

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent the Senate proceed

to the immediate consideration of Calendar No. 107, H.R. 669.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (H.R. 669) to amend the Peace Corps Act to authorize appropriations for fiscal years 2000 through 2003 to carry out that Act, and for other purposes.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

Mr. SESSIONS. I ask unanimous consent the bill be read a third time and passed, the motion to reconsider be laid upon the table, and any statements related to the measure appear in the RECORD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The bill (H.R. 669) was read the third time and passed.

#### APPOINTMENT

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair announces, on behalf of the Secretary of the Senate, pursuant to Public Law 101-509, the appointment of James B. Lloyd, of Tennessee, to the Advisory Committee on the Records of Congress.

#### ORDERS FOR THURSDAY, MAY 13, 1999

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business today, it stand in adjournment until 9:30 a.m., Thursday, May 13. I further ask consent that on Thursday, immediately following the prayer, the routine requests through the morning hour be granted, the time for the two leaders be reserved for their use later in the day, and that the Senate immediately resume consideration of the juvenile justice crime bill, S. 254. I further ask consent that at 9:30 a.m. there be 6 minutes of debate on the Hatch-Leahy amendment, equally divided in the usual form, with no amendments to the amendment in order prior to a vote at 9:40 a.m.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

#### PROGRAM

Mr. SESSIONS. For the information of all Senators, the Senate will convene on Thursday at 9:30 a.m. and immediately resume consideration of the Hatch-Leahy amendment, with a vote to take place at 9:40 a.m. Following that vote, the Senate will resume consideration of the Hollings amendment on TV violence for the remaining 2 hours of debate. Senators can therefore expect votes throughout the morning session of the Senate, with the first vote occurring tomorrow morning at 9:40.

I further ask that immediately following the 9:40 a.m. vote, Senator BRYAN be recognized for up to 12 minutes for a morning business statement.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

#### ORDER FOR ADJOURNMENT

Mr. SESSIONS. If there is no further business to come before the Senate, I now ask that the Senate stand in adjournment under the previous order at the conclusion of the remarks of Senator DORGAN, which he will commence at this time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

#### PRIVILEGE OF THE FLOOR—S. 254

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. President, if I could, before he begins his remarks, I ask unanimous consent that Kristi Lee, my staff member for the Judiciary Committee, be granted the privilege of the floor through the consideration of this legislation.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

#### VIOLENT AND REPEAT JUVENILE OFFENDER ACCOUNTABILITY AND REHABILITATION ACT OF 1999

The Senate continued with the consideration of the bill.

##### AMENDMENT NO. 328

Mr. DORGAN. Mr. President, I rise as a cosponsor, along with my colleague from South Carolina, Senator HOLLINGS, of the amendment he has just introduced, the Children's Protection From Violent Programming Act amendment.

That is kind of a long title. What it means is Senator HOLLINGS and I would like to restore in television broadcasting a period of time during the evenings when children are likely to be watching television, where the television programming would not be containing excess violence.

The reason we feel that way is study after study, year after year—in fact, for decades—studies have shown the excessive violence in television programming hurts our children. Yet, if you evaluate television programming during what would normally be considered family viewing hours in this country, you will find the language has become more coarse, words are used that were previously not used, that are not suitable for children. You will also find substantial amounts of programming violence, gratuitous violence, during those shows.

Some would say, what about censorship? I think there are times when it is appropriate for the Federal Communications Commission to establish a family viewing period in the evening where the television broadcasting would be more appropriate, more suitable for our children, when children are watching those programs. We already have an instance dealing with obscenity, and the Supreme Court has upheld the opportunity and the responsibility

given the Federal Communications Commission to carve out a period in which certain kinds of words and obscenities cannot be used because it is inappropriate for them to be used at a time when we expect children to be watching television.

We believe the same ought to be true with respect to television violence. One might say, this is much ado about nothing; television violence is nothing new; it is really not very important. Yet that is in defiance of all the conclusions of virtually all the studies. By the time young children graduate from high school in our country, they will have gone to school in classrooms for about 12,500 hours of their lives. But they will have watched television for about 20,000 hours. They have sat in a classroom 12,500 hours and sat in front of a television set 20,000 hours. Regrettably, too many of them are more a product of what they have watched than what they have read.

What is it they are watching? Some years ago I sponsored a project with a college on the North Dakota-Minnesota border that created a television violence report card. Volunteers at that college watched television programs for an entire week and cataloged each and every program and produced a report card on what kind of violence on television was being portrayed to our children. If you simply condense what our children are watching on television—yes, even during what would be considered family viewing hours—it is quite remarkable.

Imagine if someone came to your door tomorrow and said: You know, you have two children. They are age 6 and 9. We would like to put on a dramatic play for them. We have a group of actors out here in our van and we have some stage props. We would like to come into your home, into your living room, and we would like to put on a little play for your children.

So they come in. In the living room they put on a play. In this dramatic play they shoot each other, stab each other, beat each other up. Blood runs freely. There is screaming, there is horror.

You would probably say to those actors: You are just committing child abuse in my living room, doing that in front of my children. What on Earth can you be thinking of? Yet that is exactly what happens in our living rooms with that electronic box, with programming coming to our children at times when children are watching television, programming that is not fit for children.

So the response they have is, turn the television set off. Easy to say. Of course, most homes have a good number of television sets, probably two or three in different parts of the homes. In many homes there are circumstances where the parents are attentive parents, good parents, who try very hard to supervise the children's viewing habits, but it is very, very hard to do.

In fact, if you were watching, one day recently, a television set that depicted the unspeakable horror that was visited upon those students in Littleton High School, in the middle of the live reports with SWAT teams and students running out of school, with the understanding that children had been murdered, in the middle of all that one television network took a break and on came a commercial—of course, louder than everything else because commercials are always louder—advertising that you really needed to pay attention to their next big program. The next program was "Mr. Murder." You really needed to watch "Mr. Murder" because this was going to be exciting.

All of this, coming at our children in television programming, study after study points out, hurts our children. This is not helpful to children. It is hurtful to children.

Newton Minow, many, many years ago—1961 in fact—said, "Television is a vast wasteland of blood, thunder, mayhem, violence, sadism and murder." He said, "In 1961 I worried that my children would not benefit much from television. But in 1991 I worry that my children will actually be harmed by it."

Television executives produce some wonderful programming as well. You can turn to certain programs on television and be struck by the beauty and the wonder and the information. I have sat with my children watching the History Channel, for example, or certain programs on the Discovery Channel. I should not begin naming them. There are some wonderful, beautiful things from time to time on television. But there are some ugly, grotesque things on television as well, some of which come through our television sets during times children are expected to be watching.

What the Senator from South Carolina proposes is very simple: to go back to a time when we had in this country a period described by the FCC as a "family viewing period" that would be relatively free of gratuitous violence being displayed in those programs.

Is that so extreme, so radical? Do we really believe that we have to hurt our children in order to entertain our adults? I do not think so. It does not make any sense to me. There is plenty of opportunity in a lot of areas to entertain adults in this country, but it seems to me perfectly reasonable that at certain times when you expect families to be watching with children in the household that we could try to reduce the amount of violence on television.

I understand that some will portray this as a terrible idea. They will say we now have some ratings systems, and the ratings will give parents the capability of better supervising their children's viewing habits. That is true. I commend the broadcasting industry for having ratings. Not all do. One of the major networks has declined. The ratings themselves have not been used very much.